

REMARKS

The Examiner objected the drawings stating that the “lining in Fig. 3 is not appropriate.” A replacement drawing sheet which includes a formal drawing for Fig. 3 has been provided. Applicant believes that this replacement drawing addresses the Examiner’s objection. Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the objection.

Claims 1 – 24 are pending in the application. Claims 1- 19 have been rejected. Claims 1, 9, and 11 have been amended. Claims 8, and 16-19 have been canceled. Claims 20 - 25 are new.

No new matter is introduced by this amendment. Amendments to claims 1, 9, and 11 are supported at least by paragraphs 0036 and 0040 of the original specification. New claims 20-22 and 25 are supported at least by paragraph 0036 of the original specification. New claim 23 is supported at least by paragraph 28 and Figure 3 of the original specification. New claim 24 is supported at least by paragraphs 0036 and 0040 of the original specification.

Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the remarks presented below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Warren, United States Patent Application publication 2003/0153355 (“Warren”).

Independent claim 1 recites the feature “wherein when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, either the cell phone rechargeable battery or the PDA rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and PDA.” Independent claim 9 recites the feature

“wherein when the processing device and the cell phone are coupled, the processing device rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and processing device.”

Independent claim 11 recites the feature “wherein when the laptop and the cell phone are coupled, the laptop rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and laptop.”

There is no disclosure in Warren that the cell phone battery can charge the combined cell phone and processing device. There is no disclosure in Warren regarding the ability or capability of the processing device batteries to power the combination. Thus, claims 1, 9, and 11 are patentably allowable over Warren. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, claim 10 depends from claim 9, and claims 12 – 15 depend from claim 11, and these dependent claims are patentably allowable over Warren for at least the same reasons that independent claims 1, 9 and 11 are allowable.

New claims 20-25 are also independently patentable. New claim 20 recites the feature “wherein the PDA battery is the default power source for the combined cellular phone and PDA.” New claim 21 recites the feature “wherein when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, the cell phone battery can be recharged by the PDA battery.” As noted above there is no disclosure that the processing device can serve as the power source for the combination of processing device and cellular phone, so there is no disclosure that the PDA battery could be the default power supply for the combination, nor is there a disclosure of a switch to change the default to the cell phone battery. Furthermore, there is no disclosure that the cell phone battery can power the combination. Thus, new claims 20 and 21 are patentable over Warren.

New claim dependent 22 and new independent claim 25 each recite the feature “wherein when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, the cell phone battery can be recharged by the PDA battery.” New claim 24 recites the feature “wherein the laptop and the cell phone are coupled, the cell phone battery can be recharged by the laptop battery.” There

is no disclosure of recharging the cell phone battery in Warren. Thus, the new claims 22, 24 and 25 are patentable over Warren.

New claim 23 recites the feature "wherein the PDA further comprises a sliding door that can conceal the cell phone, and that can also slide open to allow the access to the cell phone when it is coupled to the PDA." Warren discloses a number of embodiments for attaching a cell phone to the input/output device. However, none of the embodiments consists of a cut-out portion or cavity to hold the phone with a sliding door to protect it when not in use, but allowing access to the cell phone key pad by moving the sliding door. Embodiments illustrated in Figures 14 and 15 show a cavity or cut-out portion to hold the phone, but the phone is enclosed in a sleeve, and to obtain access to the front of the phone, the sleeve slides out of the cavity. Thus, the phone must be removed from the cavity or cut-out portion in order to obtain access to the phone. A similar situation exists with the embodiments shown in figures 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, and 12, where the cell phone must be partially or completely removed from the cavity in the device to access the cell phone. In those embodiments illustrated in Figures 3, 6, and 8, access to the cell phone is possible, the front key pad is unprotected at all time. Thus, claim 23 is patentable over Warren.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner please remove the rejection of claims 1 – 7, and 9-15. Rejection of claims 8 and claims 16-19 is moot in light of their cancellation.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing claim amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance. If necessary to ensure a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to provide a timely response. Please charge any fees to **Deposit Account No. 07-1850**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

September 10 2007
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.

One Maritime Plaza

Suite 300

San Francisco, CA 94111

Facsimile (415) 954.0397

Telephone (415) 954-0200

Gloria M. Gusler

Gloria Gusler, Ph.D.

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 50,282

Application No. 10/804,857
Response to Office Action March 8, 2007
Amendment dated September 10, 2007

Attorney Docket: 088094-00002
Express Mail No: EV 687 139 523 US

APPENDIX